

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 stand canceled, claims 56, 57, 68, 69, and originally numbered claims 79 and 80 (claims 80 and 81) are canceled herein.

In paragraph 2, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the length exceeds 150 words. The abstract of the disclosure is amended herein to be less than 150 words. Allowance of the abstract of the disclosure as amended is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3, claims 73-80 are rejected under 37 CFR 1.126 because claim number 72 was inadvertently repeated. Originally numbered Claims 72 (second instance)-78 have been renumbered as claims 73-79, and originally number claims 79 and 80 (claims 80 and 81) are canceled. It is respectfully submitted that the objection under 37 CFR 1.126 has been overcome, and it is respectfully requested that renumbered claims 73-79 be allowed.

In paragraph 4, claims 47, 59, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because of the use of "large number" and "small number". Claims 47, 59, and 71 have been amended to claim a first number and a second number, with the second number being smaller than the first number. It is respectfully submitted that claims 47, 59 and 71, as amended, are now in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 5 and 6, claims 46-55; 58-17; and 70-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by White, U.S. Patent 5,428,782 (hereafter White). In paragraphs 7 and 8, claims 56, 67, 68, 80 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent 5,806,062 (hereinafter Chen). It is submitted that

Claims 46, 58, and 70 as amended overcome the rejections. Claims 56, 57, 68, 69, 80 (originally numbered 79), and 81 (originally numbered 80) have been canceled.

White is directed to a system and method for a computer software architecture enabling a plurality of computers and associated computer resources, some or all of which may be heterogeneous in configuration, to cooperatively process a variety of applications such that the user sees the same image of the application no matter where the application is actually executing (Col. 1, lines 20-27). The present invention, as claimed in amended claims 46, 58, and 70, is directed to migrating Business Applications executed on a data processing system to a modern environment. The claimed Business Applications to be migrated are controlled by panels wherein the Business Applications may enter succeeding Business Application panels transparently and autonomously in a sequence of panels, as claimed. In White, a Transaction Definition File (TDF) is used by a Generate Transaction Definition (GTD) as a blueprint for construction a Distributed Applications Architecture (DAA) transaction. A programmer uses the GTD's menus and screens to add and delete the appropriate components and GTD files this information into the TDF (see Col. 9, lines 58-66). Further, At Col. 11, lines 33-39, application programmers define application components and their interrelationships by using definition screens within GTD. They include procedure code, panel maps, menus, program data views and documentation. This is quite a daunting task when the user of White must define the interrelationships for a large number of panels (many times numbering in the hundreds of panels).

However, as claimed in claims 46, 58 and 70, there is no programmer defining of interrelationships of panels as the panels are enabled to transparently and autonomously execute the underlying Business Applications by handling a sequence of

Business Application panels. Further claimed is "transparently signaling Transaction Objects in a least one of said Transaction Object Methods to execute Business Applications to create Business Objects, said Business Objects being maintained in Business Object Instance Space in the database;". The examiner has cited Column 17, lines 38-48 of White as showing this element. However, this portion of White only says that users of a network may access data bases in various portions of the network to process named transactions. It is respectfully submitted that White does not teach or suggest that Business Objects are created by transparently signaling Transaction Objects in at least one of the Transaction Object Methods, and that Business Objects are maintained in Business Object Instance Space in the database, as claimed.

Chen is directed to software architecture in which differences between a first document and a second document are analyzed (Col. 2, lines 20-24). Document difference information is presented to the user as a directed graph via a graphical interface (col. 2, lines 40-42). Thus, Chen looks forward to compare a first document to a second, later document and graphs the differences. In claims 46, 58 and 70, as amended herein, the Transaction Object Methods are placed into a graph to determine predecessors of Business Applications to determine legacy Business Applications for providing data and Business Objects that are needed to migrate from an old environment to a modern environment. Again, this is done automatically, without input from a user. Thus, in the present invention, as claimed, Transaction Object Methods look backward to predecessors to determine what data and Business Objects are needed from legacy Business Applications to perform the Transaction Object Methods in the new environment. This is not taught or suggested in either White or Chen, or any combination of White and Chen. It is respectfully submitted that claims 46, 58, and 70, and all claims depended therefrom, are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102

over White, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over White in view of Chen, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Floyd A. Gonzalez". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

BY: FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney

Registration No. 26,732

Phone: 615-904-1954